

- Application No. 10/736,533
- Reply to Office Action of January 18, 2007

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 12. This sheet, which includes Fig. 12, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 12.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to address the informalities noted in paragraph 1 of the Office Action, and to make a few further minor formal changes. One change is made to the Abstract.

A drawing change is submitted to supply the English text for box F3 of Figure 12. Please note the English text is a translation of the Japanese text in box F3.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-12 are present in this application. Claims 2 and 3 are canceled by way of the present amendment. Claim 1 was objected to as having informalities. Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claims 1, 2, 7 and 12 are rejected over U.S. 2002/0090058 (Yasuda et al.) in view of U.S. 6,055,295 (Murthy et al.), and claim 3 is rejected over Yasuda et al. in view of Murthy et al. and further in view of U.S. 4,766,603 (Okabe et al.). Claims 4, 9 and 10 were found to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the § 112 rejection and to include the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims, and claims 5, 6, 8 and 11 were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The claims have been amended to address both the objections and rejection under § 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in full compliance with the requirements of § 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is amended to include the elements of claims 3 and 4 and it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 5-10 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 12 is amended to recite steps not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art. Claim 12 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

In particular, Claim 12 recites that the imaging parameters include a relative moving speed of one of the tabletop and the support apparatus with respect to each other depending on a speed of the X-ray contrast agent flowing in the object, and recites performing the imaging scan on the object according to the imaging parameters with controlling a radiation field of the X-ray on the object in the direction depending upon the moving speed and the imaging parameters.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a favorable decision to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No. 28,870

Carl E. Schlier
Registration No. 34,426
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

I:\ATTYCES\246747US-AM-DUE-5-18-07.DOC